

December 21, 2015

Gary Fuller, Principal Planner
Akida Rouzi, Senior Planner
Carly Aubrey, Senior Planner
Department of Planning
300 Park Avenue
Falls Church, VA 22046

Re: Broad and Washington (Munis #2015-0764)

Dear Gary, Akida, and Carly:

On behalf of the Applicant, Broad and Washington, LLC, enclosed please find the following revised documents.

- Parking Study dated June 19, 2015 and revised through December 3, 2015 (22 copies);
- TIA and TDM Study dated December 9, 2015 (5 copies with CD of data tables, 17 copies without data tables);
- Draft Voluntary Concessions (22 copies);
- Revised Project Book (22 copies);
- Revised Plan Sets (22 full size copies, 22 reduced size copies);
- CD with all resubmission documents (1 copy).

Additionally, please find our responses to the City's staff comment letter dated September 28, 2015 below.

Planning and Development Review

Conceptual Development Plan and Site Plan Requirements

1. Sheet C2.0: add under the requested land use actions reference to Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Plan Map Amendment per the proposed amendment from Business and Transitional to Mixed-Use.

Response: Requested Comprehensive Plan amendment notation has been added.

2. Include in the Conceptual Development Plan the preliminary survey plat as a sheet for a comprehensive plan package.

Response: The preliminary survey plat has been added to the CDP as requested, see sheet C3.0.

3. Sheet C2.0: under Waiver/Modifications requested, indicate clearly the required parking and reductions requested.

Response: The corrected parking provisions have been added to the waivers/modifications statement as requested.

4. Sheet C2.0: when applicable add additional description to any waivers identified - how far is the parking entrance on Park Place from a residential district?

Response: Additional waivers have been identified to the best of our knowledge. The eastern edge of the proposed parking entrance (on Park Place) is approximately 115 feet to the residential zone to the east.

5. Sheet C2.0: from the dimensions provided on the plans, buffer provided along the north east side of the site abutting an R district appears to be less than the 20 feet required by code. Are there any reductions requested in the buffer width and density? Per comment #4, if applicable add references to any waivers being requested.

Response: The building setback ('Side/Rear Yard') adjacent to the R district has been adjusted to 20 foot minimum as shown on sheet C4.0. The landscape Buffer Yard is proposed to be a Type 'E' (15 foot width) with additional plantings and 6 foot high screen fence as shown on Sheet C5.0.

6. If one has not been submitted, provide an electronic copy of the metes and bounds description as shown on the plat.

Response: An electronic version of the metes and bounds description is included in this resubmission.

7. Sheet C4.0 – add references to the Adopted Streetscape Standards for West Broad Street particularly for the East Broad Street frontage to indicate compliance with the standards. The City's adopted Design Guidelines and Comprehensive Plan both call for the West Broad Streetscape Standards for the plan area that includes a section of the East Broad Street. The streetscape design has already been built for most of the West Broad Street corridor. Any other application documents, including the pending draft of VCs that speak to streetscape standards should also include such reference as appropriate.

Response: The referenced note has been added to sheets C4.0 and C5.0 as requested.

8. Sheet C4.0 and C5.0: add all street centerline distances and label accordingly for ALL streets; add and label dedications for public street right-of-way for ALL planned streetscape areas.

Response: Centerline distances have been labeled for all streets as shown on sheet C3.0 and C4.0. Proposed street dedication and Public Access Easement areas and computations have been indicated on sheet C8.0.

9. Are all existing and proposed easements shown per the site plan requirements?

Response: Existing easements are shown on sheet C3.0 and C15.0. Proposed easements are shown on sheet C4.1 and C8.0. Additional or revised easements may be determined at the time of final site plan submission.

10. General location and dimensions of all bicycle storage areas will need to be shown.

Response: External proposed potential bike rack and bike share facility locations have been indicated on sheet C5.0 of the CDP. Refer to architectural documents for location of internal bike facility locations.

11. General locations of trash bay/areas should be shown.

Response: Trash/recycling and compactor area has been indicated on sheet C4.0 of the CDP. Those service areas are proposed on the north side of the building, accessible from Park Place, and are located adjacent to the loading areas.

12. Interior parking lot landscaping requires 5 percent interior landscape coverage.

Response: A request for waiver of the 5% interior parking lot landscape coverage as well as perimeter parking lot landscaping has been included within the waivers/modifications statement on sheet C2.0

13. Provide a CD with complete application re-submission including, all application materials, conceptual development plan, architectural plans, traffic study, parking management plan, TDC, draft Voluntary Concessions and written response to staff comments.

Response: A CD with the complete application re-submission is included.

Draft Voluntary Concessions, Community Benefits, Terms and Conditions (VC's)

14. Draft VC was not submitted. Meeting with City management to be determined, and City's standard conditions to be provided.

Response: Draft voluntary concessions are enclosed. They are preliminary in nature and will be updated subject to further discussions with City management.

Applications, Justifications, Letters, Statements and Architectural Plans

15. All statements and justifications will need to be resubmitted to reflect the draft VCs when one is submitted. Special exceptions criteria references and justifications will be revised and resubmitted as the draft VC's undergo review and updates.

Response: Updated application materials are included.

16. Fiscal impact data sheet was updated by the Applicant and resubmitted to the Economic Development Office. Hard copies of the application package will need to be updated to reflect any changes made to its content prior to any scheduled public hearing.

Response: Acknowledged

17. Special Exceptions – the special exception criteria in section 48-488 regarding “exemplary” projects specifically requires appropriate step backs for any height bonus consideration in a B-2 district that abuts an R-district. This requirement is applicable for portions of the site along north and east elevations abutting the R-district. Step backs should be provided at 35 feet (or adjacent structure height), and 75 feet (maximum by right height of the B-2 district). Additionally, the heights of all structures abutting an R-district are to be “tapered to be compatible with the maximum allowed heights, in both districts.” Design of the building elevations abutting the R-district should take into consideration appropriate buffer and transitional elements to achieve compatibility.

Response: The applicant believes the current building provides a transition and buffer that achieve compatibility with the adjacent R-district. A buffer area is provided adjacent to the residential use on Lawton Street. Additionally, a new courtyard has been created to further pull the building away from that adjacent home. The applicant has worked diligently with surrounding residential property owners to revise the building design and achieve greater compatibility with their homes.

18. In future submissions, where step backs are provided per the code, indicate height and depth of steps backs in both the architectural and conceptual development plan.

Response: Vertical height dimensions have been added where necessary.

19. Comprehensive Plan, Future Land Use Plan Map Amendment – The parcel/area for the proposed map amendment needs to be graphically depicted on the certified survey plat and a corresponding metes and bounds description will need to be provided electronically.

Response: The parcel of proposed zoning map amendment (Parcel 53-104-050) has been graphically depicted on sheet C15.0 as requested. The metes and bounds of that subject parcel has also been provided on that sheet.

20. Architectural Plan pages 22-23: for parking levels/plans provide summary tables with parking tabulation for each floor, uses and total. Include sample dimensions for parking and drive aisle.

Response: See Appendix 6 for updated summary tables for each floor as well as sample dimensions for parking and drive aisle.

21. Architectural Plan pages 18-19: conceptual streetscape plans should reflect the Adopted Streetscape Standards for West Broad Street particularly for the East broad street frontage. See comment 7 for details.

Response: Acknowledged.

22. Architectural Plan pages 14-15: for all building elevations and sections provide vertical height dimensions. In future submissions, where step backs are provided per required by the code, indicate height and depth of steps backs.

Response: Vertical height dimensions have been added where necessary.

Zoning Code

23. The requested parking reduction is subject to further study and justification by the Applicant per the memo provided on August 5, 2015 with the application submission outlining intent and study objectives.

Response: The proposed parking levels are described in the enclosed Parking Study. The Parking Study responds to preliminary discussions with City management on October 8, 2015. The final parking numbers will continue to evolve based upon discussions with City management. Based on the current parking study, it is anticipated that all public parking spaces being removed with this proposal will be replaced with an equal amount of public parking spaces in the proposed garage. Additional public parking is shown in the parking study. The final number of additional parking spaces will be negotiated with City management, and it is anticipated they will be paid for by the City as part of negotiations for the sale of the City parking lot.

24. Per comment #4 above, clearly identify any landscape waivers with specific references to the applicable zoning code section on sheet C2.0 of the conceptual development plan.

Response: Acknowledged. It is our belief that all applicable waivers/modifications have been requested as shown on sheet C2.0, within the waivers/modifications statement.

25. Shared parking study may be needed for mixed-use developments in which two or more users exist on the same site, with further staff review/refinement of the TDM and future discussions with the Applicant, appropriate required parking may be determined by applying a shared parking formula. The Planning Commission may consider

modifications to parking requirements based upon studies or site evaluations to determine the acceptable number of spaces under section 48-971 (2).

Response: The proposed parking levels are described in the enclosed Parking Study. The Parking Study responds to preliminary discussions with City management on October 8, 2015. The final parking numbers will continue to evolve based upon discussions with City management.

Official Zoning Map Amendment

26. The rezoning of the existing T-1 parcel to B-2 to allow for the consolidation of the entire site for the proposed mixed-use development, and to achieve the height bonus allowed for the B-2 zone is a rational approach. However, since the existing T-1 parcel is abutting an R-district to the immediate north, the justification for the rezoning will rely heavily on the overall compatibility of the project that includes contextual sensitivity, visual impact, and appropriate buffer and transition to the residential zone. These elements are subject to further staff review.

Response: Acknowledged.

Special Exception(s)

27. Justification for how the special exceptions primary and secondary criteria provided as part of the application package was reviewed. "Exemplary" redevelopment project evaluation to be determined as the Voluntary Concessions and other project elements are revised and refined.

Response: Draft voluntary concessions are enclosed. They are preliminary in nature and will be updated subject to further discussions with City management.

28. Staff evaluation and review based on primary and secondary special exception criteria is also pending submission and review of Voluntary Concessions.

Response: Draft voluntary concessions are enclosed. They are preliminary in nature and will be updated subject to further discussions with City management.

29. Special Exceptions – the special exception criteria in section 48-488 regarding "exemplary" projects specifically requires appropriate step backs for any height bonus consideration in a B-2 district that abuts an R-district. This requirement is applicable for portions of the site along north and east elevations abutting the R-district. Step backs should be provided at 35 feet (or adjacent structure height), and 75 feet (maximum by right height of the B-2 district). Additionally, the heights of all structures abutting an R-district are to be "tapered to be compatible with the maximum allowed heights, in both districts." Design of the building elevations abutting the R-district should take into consideration appropriate buffer and transitional elements to achieve compatibility.

Response: The applicant believes the current building provides a transition and buffer that achieve compatibility with the adjacent R-district. A buffer area is provided adjacent to the residential use on Lawton Street. Additionally, a new courtyard has been created to further pull the building away from that adjacent home. The applicant has worked diligently with surrounding residential property owners to revise the building design and achieve greater compatibility with their homes.

30. In future submissions, where step backs are provided per the code, indicate height and depth of steps backs.

Response: Acknowledged

31. Draft VCs will need to be submitted for city staff review and comments as part of the justification provided for how the project meets the primary and secondary criteria for the special exception evaluation.

Response: Draft voluntary concessions are enclosed. They are preliminary in nature and will be updated subject to further discussions with City management.

32. Potential traffic impacts and necessary transportation improvements are continued subject of discussion as the project moves forward. See related staff comments in Enclosure 1 and 2.

Response: See responses to individual comments below

Special Exceptions(s) continued – Evaluation Criteria

Under Division 3, Amendments, Section 48-90 – Special Exceptions and 48-488 - Special Exceptions in B-2 District, the following are key criteria for evaluation of the requested specials exceptions:

1. Related zoning (rezoning) and land use changes (map amendments) justifications, letters and documents dated July 26 through August 5, 2015. Staff analysis and review of City code, policy and guidelines.

Response: Acknowledged

2. Primary and secondary, special exception criteria – Applicant's justification statements and related staff review comments.

Response: Acknowledged

3. "Exemplary" redevelopment project evaluation, for height bonus justification. Proposed buildings have specific step back considerations when adjacent to (R), residential districts at both maximum adjacent residential district height and subject site B-2, business district maximum height by right.

Response: Acknowledged

4. "Preferred uses" – two level grocery store - pending further review.

Response: Acknowledged

5. Voluntary Concessions, Community Benefits and Terms and Conditions to be submitted for staff review and evaluation.

Response: Voluntary Concessions, Community Benefits and Terms and Conditions are included in this resubmission.

6. Traffic impacts and necessary transportation improvements – Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) and Conceptual Development Plan (CDP) dated July 26 through August 5, 2015. Transportation Demand Management Plan (TDM) and Parking Management Plan to be submitted for staff review.

Response: Revised TIA and CDP, along with a TDM and Parking Management Plan, are included in this resubmission.

Comprehensive Plan and Planning Commission Rules and Procedures

The requested Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Plan Map change is from "Business" and "Transitional" to "Mixed-Use." The justification provided by the applicant for the proposed Broad and Washington mixed-use project is based on general goals and objectives identified for the Downtown/City Center Opportunity area. Further staff review of the project in parallel with community benefits offered through the Voluntary Concessions is needed.

Transportation Planning

1. See memorandum, dated August 28, 2015 for comments and further details (Enclosure 1).

Response: Acknowledged. See below responses.

TDM and Parking Management Plan

2. The City's Mobility for all Modes Plan established the following strategy, "To the extent possible, meet increased travel demand within, from, and through the City via non-automobile modes." TDM and Parking Management plans for new developments are critical tools for this strategy. I recommend City staff meet with the development team soon to develop a draft TDM plan. The TDM Plan should include mode share goals and a clearly defined set of elements.

Response: A meeting with City staff and the development team was held on November 9, 2015. One of the topics of that meeting was TDM strategies. Specific mode share goals have been added to the TDM section of the Traffic Impact Study.

3. Oversupply of automobile parking spaces can have negative consequences for the community, including inducing additional automobile trips and diverting funds that would otherwise be spent on community amenities. City staff and the development team should work together to develop an appropriate level of automobile parking for the proposed project.

Response: The proposed parking levels are described in the enclosed Parking Study. The Parking Study responds to preliminary discussions with City management on October 8, 2015. The final parking numbers will continue to evolve based upon discussions with City management.

Pedestrian Access

4. Clarify the location of the building entrances so that access can be evaluated.

Response: The proposed building entry locations have been identified on CDP sheet C4.0 as requested.

5. Identify possible locations for outdoor dining so that sufficient clear space can be identified.

Response: Areas of potential outdoor dining have been indicated on sheet C4.0.

6. Replace the ramp at the NE corner of Broad and Washington with two ramps, one in each direction and assess the potential to make similar changes at the NW and SE corners.

Response: It is the applicant's belief that the introduction of a second handicap ramp at the NE corner will create an undesirable condition of the crosswalk alignment to the receiving ramps and a potentially difficult movement for the visually impaired public. An additional ramp would also require the relocation of the traffic signal pole, alteration of the traffic control stop bars to move them further east (westbound Broad St) and north (southbound N. Washington St) thereby reducing the storage capacity of the turn lanes etc.

Introduction of additional ramps at the NW corner would require encroachment (requiring dedication/easements) into the Brown's Hardware property, loss of storage space within their sales yard, relocation of the recently installed pedestrian signals, and removal/relocation of the traffic signal pedestal control box.

Introduction of additional ramps at the SE corner would require relocation of the recently installed pedestrian signals, potential relocation of the raised landscape planter walls, reduction of the raised median (northbound N. Washington St), alteration of the traffic control stop bars to move them further south (northbound N. Washington St) thereby reducing the storage capacity of the turn lanes etc.

7. Replace the curving sidewalk on the east edge of the site with a straight sidewalk.

December 21, 2015

Page 10

Response: The curved sidewalk has been replaced with a straight sidewalk adjacent to the proposed east building wall as shown on sheet C4.0.

Bicycle Parking and Access

8. The City's Bicycle Master Plan identifies Broad St and Washington St as bike-share corridors. A prominent/visible location should be identified for placement of a bike-share station. Capital costs and ongoing operating expenses for the station should be included as part of the site's TDM plan.

Response: A potential bike-share location has been identified near the center of the E. Broad Street frontage of the building (Sheet C6.0). This location provides for the typical space requirement (14'x40') for Capital Bikeshare. Pending discussions with Capital Bikeshare, the final TDM plan may incorporate some level of expenditure for the bike share station.

A potential bike share facility location has been identified along E. Broad St as shown on sheet C5.0. The final location and provision of such bike share station is subject to change with final site plan approval.

9. The number of secure bicycle parking spaces should be specified.

Response: See Appendix 6 summary tables listing number of secure bicycle parking spaces provided within the building footprint. Number of spaces and standards for the same reference those stated in City of Alexandria Bicycle Parking Guide.

Secure parking for 112 bicycles has been added to the P3 level of the garage, as noted in the plan set and the TDM plan.

10. The location of short-term, outdoor bike racks should be specified.

Response: Convenient bicycle parking for short-term users has been added around the perimeter of the building, as noted in the plan set and the TDM plan. A total of 18 spaces are shown in three distinct areas along E. Broad Street. An additional 8 spaces would be available in proposed bus shelters.

The proposed short term outdoor bike racks are proposed to be co-located with the two proposed bus stop locations at the northeast quadrant of N. Washington St and E. Broad St as shown on sheet C5.0. Potential additional bike rack locations have been indicated along E. Broad St as shown on sheet C5.0.

11. The City Alexandria Bicycle Parking Guide (attached) provides an easy to understand reference for number of bike parking spaces, location of outdoor spaces, and requirements for secure spaces.

Response: The Alexandria Guide was used to locate and size the bike parking areas referenced in Responses 9 and 10 above.

Transit Access

12. Regarding the proposed bus shelter, please reference the City's Bus Stop and Bus Shelter Master Plan for spacing requirements. Bus Shelters should be positioned at least 4' behind the curb to avoid collisions and 30' of clear space should be provided to allow access from both bus doors.

Response: As discussed in the meeting held with staff on November 9, 2015, the proposed bus stop designs have been revised and coordinated as requested. Refer to sheets C4.0 and C7.1.

13. Regarding the proposed bus shelter, please reference the City's Bus Stop and Bus Shelter Master Plan for site amenities. Bus Stops should provide trash and recycling cans and bike racks.

Response: Trash/recycle cans and bike racks have been provided as requested. See sheet C7.1 for bus stop elements.

14. A second bus shelter should be provided for northbound service on N Washington St. This stop would replace the existing bus stop on S Washington St. The shelter should be positioned approximately 60' north of the intersection.

Response: The requested bus stop has been provided, see sheet C4.0.

Automobile Access and Parking

15. The proposal of on-street parking along Broad St could benefit the character of the area and help develop the walkable environment discussed in the City's Comprehensive Plan and Downtown Small Area Plan. This idea should be discussed internally with City staff.

Response: Acknowledged.

16. Curb lines should be moved as necessary to standardize travel lane widths at 11' on Broad St and Washington St.

Response: As demonstrated on sheet C3.0, the existing lane widths are a minimum of 11 feet wide, no adjustment of the curb should be necessary.

Traffic Impact Study

17. The Traffic Impact Study assumes a regional vehicle trip growth rate of 1% annually. However, according to historical traffic counts available on the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) website, vehicle volumes on Broad St and Washington St in the vicinity of the project have decreased over the last 10 years. National and state level trends have showed Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) leveling off in recent years. The growth rate assumption be revisited.

Response: Consistent with the historic traffic trend, the growth assumption has been revised to show a 0% growth rate over the course of the study period. The traffic forecasts in the revised TIA reflect this change.

18. The Traffic Impact Study uses the Institute for Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation model. VDOT recent approved the use of a mixed-use trip generation model for more developed environments, like the City of Falls Church. I recommend that the mixed use trip generation model be used to validate the trip generation numbers generated by the ITE model.

Response: The Mixed-Use Trip Generation Model was evaluated in detail for this redevelopment proposal. While the underlying computations and component results are not available to the user, the overall trip reductions estimated by the model are consistent with the ITE methodology including standard reductions. Because of the more detailed data by direction and land use, the ITE estimates were used to develop traffic assignments and conduct the intersection capacity analysis.

Department of Public Works

Transportation Engineering

Report - Traffic Impact Analysis

1. See memorandum, dated September 4, 2015 for comments and further details (Enclosure 2).

Response: Acknowledged. Responses provided below.

2. The population growth rate should be based on historical traffic volume data, which VDOT has for VA-7 (Broad Street) and US-29 (Washington Street). If the data shows that traffic volumes have steadily declined, then a 0% growth rate shall be used.

Response: Consistent with the historic traffic trend, the growth assumption has been revised to show a 0% growth rate over the course of the study period. The traffic forecasts in the revised TIA reflect this change.

3. List roadways without cardinal designations when describing their intersection with Broad or Washington Street (i.e., Columbia Street instead of "E./W. Columbia Street" and Washington Street instead of "N./S. Washington Street").

Response: The roadway references have been simplified in the TIA.

4. Verify ADT along South Washington Street as presented in the Roadway Network section.

Response: The currently-published VDOT ADT was verified for this segment. Additionally, it was checked against previous years and is similar to past ADTs and consistently lower than the volume north of Broad Street. ADTs computed from the traffic counts and assuming a k-factor of 0.10 are higher than the published value south of Broad Street, but lower than VDOT values to the north.

5. The speed limit along all roadways within the City of Falls Church, except for Washington Street, is 25 MPH.

Response: The TIA has been updated to reflect the posted/statutory speed limits.

6. Propose other mitigations (i.e., potential access changes) for the failing operations at East Broad Street and the site driveway. This is a secondary entrance and the City would not likely support signalization so close to the intersection of Broad and Washington.

Response: Based on the meeting of November 9, several alternative access scenarios were added to the traffic analysis. The results of this comparative analysis are included in the revised TIA.

7. Please provide a signal warrant analysis for the incorporation of Park Place at North Washington Street into the existing signal at Park Avenue.

Response: The Park Place leg of the intersection would be added to the existing signal controlling N. Washington Street and Park Avenue, which is the higher-volume side street and would dictate the need for a signal. Applicability aside, the peak hour signal warrant was evaluated as requested. As presented in the revised TIA, the side street volumes exceed the threshold for the peak hour warrant during the PM and Saturday peak hours for future conditions in 2020.

8. Figure 2 shows levels 1, 2 and 4. Is there a level 3?

Response: Figure 2 has been updated, but continues to show the building and parking access on levels 1 and 2 and the general shape of the building above through a typical floor. Each of the levels is depicted in more detail in the plan set. The portions of the building not shown in Figure 2 have been accounted for in the traffic analysis, but were excluded from the diagram to improve legibility.

9. Per the scoping meeting, evaluate the trip generation using VDOT's Mixed Use Development model and include results and/or your assessment of the methodology in the report.

Response: The Mixed-Use Trip Generation Model was evaluated in detail for this redevelopment proposal. While the underlying computations and component results are not available to the user, the overall trip reductions estimated by the model are consistent with the ITE model including standard reductions. Because of the more detailed data by direction

and land use, the ITE estimates were used to develop traffic assignments and conduct the intersection capacity analysis.

10. The parking management plan should reflect the City's goal to provide parking in shared "districts." Include a reference to the public parking available at Kaiser Permanente and the parking demand for The State Theatre to show how the adjacent land uses will interact with the new development.

Response: Acknowledged. A parking study is included with this resubmission.

11. Include trip reduction goals (separated by land use) in the TDM.

Response: Specific mode share goals have been added to the TDM section of the Traffic Impact Study.

12. Stay consistent with the presentation of the signal phasing at the intersection of North Washington Street and Park Avenue.

Response: The analysis has been updated with additional scenarios. Future conditions with existing traffic control, with full-movement unsignalized access, and with signal control are included in the revised TIA.

13. Except for the mitigation alternative, include a Synchro report for every study intersection for each peak period.

Response: All Synchro reports for the existing conditions and future with and without development scenarios have been included in the report. For the additional access alternatives, the impacts at the main driveways and at the Broad Street and Washington Street intersection were compared.

14. In the 2020 Future With Development alternative, Park Avenue is grouped with Park Place and is shown as unsignalized. Separate these intersections, showing Park Avenue as signalized and Park Place as stop-controlled.

Response: The analysis has been updated with additional scenarios. Future conditions with existing traffic control, with full-movement unsignalized access, and with signal control are included in the revised TIA.

Plan – Transportation

15. The pedestrian clear zone is insufficient in some areas along W Broad St. The addition of on-street parking space is generally supported, but not at the expense of sufficient sidewalk area.

Response: As discussed with staff during meeting held on November 9, 2015, the minimum clear width of the proposed pedestrian zone of the sidewalk along E. Broad St is 8 feet. This width was acknowledged to be sufficient on E. Broad.

16. Proposed signal equipment is not shown in the renderings of the site or on the conceptual layout. Show this to demonstrate that the canopy will not conflict with signal poles and that sufficient pedestrian space will be available.

Response: Renderings have been updated to include signal equipment where seen.

17. Show proposed location for a new traffic signal at the intersection of Park Place and N Washington St.

Response: Acknowledged. A traffic signal is now shown on revised plan.

Engineering

Plan - Utilities

18. The City will request additional storage capacity for stormwater runoff due to flooding within this sub-watershed. The City is analyzing the storm model to develop a specific quantity of storage, which we anticipate to be available within 2-3 weeks.

Response: As noted in recent discussion with DPW staff, no additional modeling is currently available from the CFC. Therefore, the applicant will continue to conform with the current guidelines as prescribed in the CFC SWM ordinance.

Urban Forestry

Plan – Urban Forestry

19. The sidewalk should be wider, allowing the planters and trees to be farther from the building. Average canopies are likely to be 12-13 feet in radius; any space beyond that distance will help maintain the trees' symmetrical growth and decrease the need for maintenance. Keep in mind that the tree canopies will be widest at 10-15 feet from the ground (or 14-19 feet, if the tree is pruned evenly on both the street and sidewalk sides), and design arcades and overhangs accordingly.

Response: As discussed with CFC Transportation Planning and Engineering staff during meeting held on November 9, 2015, the minimum clear width of the proposed pedestrian zone of the sidewalk along E. Broad St is 8 feet. This width is typical and standard per the streetscape design guidelines for the W. Broad St, and subsequent E. Broad St.

20. If on-street parking is allowed, then the accepted Broad Street streetscape planter design, with a minimum length of 15 feet, may be too long to allow good access to and from car doors. Any change in planter design should be discussed with the city.

Response: An eighteen inch wide 'step off' zone has been provided between the face of curb and edge of planter pit in order to accommodate the on street parking passenger entry/exit onto the sidewalk. See details on sheet C6.0.

21. Street trees should have planting soil that extends underground beyond the planter openings; a continuous planting soil trench at least 6 feet wide should run the length of the planted area.

Response: Acknowledged. Final detail and design of the street tree planter pit will be provided with the final site plan submission drawings.

22. The developer must provide an irrigation system for the street tree planters, metered separately from the building.

Response: Acknowledged.

23. Park Place landscaping has been completely overlooked. Adding a planting strip and trees along this access road would greatly increase the attractiveness and ecological function of the back side of the building.

Response: Additional street tree plantings have been provided along Park Place as suggested, see sheet C5.0. The tree species will be a medium canopy category tree due to the presence of the overhead utility lines, as allowed by the CFC code.

24. Saving the existing trees as shown near Lawton Street may require unusual construction techniques. Be sure that an experienced certified arborist finds the existing trees worthy of the additional expense needed to protect them.

Response: Acknowledged.

25. During project design, please provide a single sheet showing tree, street light, other outdoor lighting and security camera locations, in both plan and section views, so we can see that their interactions have been planned out.

Response: Acknowledged. Requested materials will be demonstrated at the time of final site plan.

Fairfax Water

1. See memorandum, dated August 14, 2015 for comments and further details (Enclosure 3).

Response: Acknowledged. See responses below.

2. The property can be served by Fairfax Water.

Response: Acknowledged.

3. Adequate domestic water service is available at the site from existing 12-inch water main located in Lawton Street, 8-inch water main located in East Broad Street and 6-inch and 12-inch water main located in North Washington Street. See the enclosed water system map.

Response: Acknowledged.

4. Depending upon the configuration of any proposed on-site water mains, additional water mains, additional water main extensions may be necessary to satisfy fire flow requirements and accommodate water quality concerns.

Response: Acknowledged.

Zoning

1. See memorandum, dated August 28, 2015 for comments and further details (Enclosure 4).

Response: Acknowledged. See responses below

Parking:

2. Use 1:300 for office use rather than 1:250. This is consistent with previous applications.

Response: The parking tabulation for office use has been revised as suggested, see sheet C2.0.

3. If practical, delineate the square footage that will be used as "warehousing" and storage in the grocery and use 1:1000 for those areas and 1:200 for the balance of the grocery. If other areas within the site lend themselves to a similar process, propose it for review.

Response: The suggested areas have been outlined as demonstrated on the Parking Tabulations shown on sheet C2.0.

4. With regard to the proposed loading spaces: no parking/loading is permitted in a setback, which is 14 feet from the property line that separates the loading spaces from the abutting properties near Park Place, see Sec. 48-939. However, portions covered by a roof are allowed a zero setback. Therefore, extend the roof to cover the portions of the loading spaces that are shown uncovered and within 14 feet of the property line. Alternately,

cover the entire loading area with a roof, which on the plan is roughly delineated by the proposed "fence around loading" as indicated on p.18 of Appendix 6.

Response: The covered roof over the loading area has been delineated as shown on sheet C4.0. The northern edge of the loading area is set back beyond 14 feet from the property line.

5. Maintain a minimum vertical clearance free of all obstructions to a height of 15 feet for all portions of the loading spaces, see Sec. 48-934.

Response: All loading spaces within the building as well as drive aisles leading to them have been designed with 15' minimum height clearance per Sec. 48-934.

6. The proposed parking provided is a 33% shortfall, the justification for which requires approval by the Planning Commission.

Response: The proposed parking levels are described in the enclosed Parking Study. The Parking Study responds to preliminary discussions with City management on October 8, 2015. The final parking numbers will continue to evolve based upon discussions with City management.

7. Provide a construction parking plan that locates construction trailers and provides for the parking of the construction crew and related staff.

Response: The requested construction parking plan will be provided as part of the final site plan submission documents.

General:

8. Confirm transformers are not located in a yard abutting street, Sec. 48-1102(j).

Response: The proposed underground transformers and electrical equipment vault are located within the 14 foot yard adjacent to Park Place. A waiver of this setback requirement has been requested as demonstrated on sheet C2.0.

9. Provide 25-foot site triangles for the intersections of the vehicle driveways along Park Place, East Broad and N. Washington, to confirm there are no vision obstructions as provided for in Sec. 48-1103.

Response: The requested vision triangles have been provided on sheet C4.0.

10. Provide a wall check survey to Zoning as soon as it is available.

Response: Existing building locations are indicated on sheet C3.0. Proposed building wall check survey will be provided as part of the final construction and as-built documents for the new construction.

Signs and Review by AAB:

11. Provide a uniform sign package as soon as practical that delineates the number, size and placement of all signs. Sign packages require approval by the AAB. Buildings of this scope typically require variances for the number and size of signs. Sign variances are heard by the AAB for recommendation and the Board of Zoning Appeals for determination.

Response: Acknowledged.

12. This application requires a site plan review by the Architectural Advisory Board (AAB), for recommendation to the Planning Commission. That board meets the first Wednesday of each month. Contact the Zoning Office for placement on that agenda.

Response: Acknowledged.

Roof-Mounted Utilities:

13. Screen all roof-mounted utilities from pedestrian view.

Response: Acknowledged.

14. Staff has noted a surge in applications for roof-mounted wireless communications equipment on tall buildings in the City. These require a special use permit, with a recommendation from the Planning Commission and approval by the Board of Zoning Appeals. Staff suggests the applicant simplify that process by including a concurrent application for a special use permit that will pre-approve the building for such installations. The primary review criteria have been that such installations not have any ground-based equipment and that roof-based equipment be screened from pedestrian view. Zoning staff can assist in framing that request.

Response: Acknowledged.

Building Safety

1. See memorandum, dated September 9, 2015 for comments and further details (Enclosure 5).

Response: Acknowledged. See responses below.

2. Please submit a description of the structure.

Response: A short description as well as graphical information conveying the same has been added to the Architectural Sections on Page 16.

3. Please submit a code analysis and life safety plan.

Response: This information will be determined and provided as we evolve the design in consultation with the city.

4. Please submit a LEED check list.

Response: This information will be determined and provided as we evolve the design in consultation with the city.

5. Please submit a fire flow calculation.

Response: This information will be determined and provided as we evolve the design in consultation with the city.

Fire Official

1. See memorandum, dated September 2, 2015 for comments and further details (Enclosure 6).

Response: Acknowledged. See responses below.

2. Identify high-rise fire protection package: The building footprint with parking will impose a challenge for fire/rescue units due to the limited accessibility for the Fire Department. A clear definition of the intent of providing a high-rise fire protection package shall be clearly stated. This shall include all typical components including, but not limited to, generator, pressurized stairwells, fire pump, monitored alarm system and fire command center.

Response: The intent of providing a high-rise protection package will be refined and determined in subsequent deliberations with the city.

3. Show location of Fire System components and rooms: fire control room, fire pump room, electrical rooms, generator location, and chemical room (if equipped with a swimming pool), fire hydrant locations, fire enunciator panel, main fire control panel, FDC location and fire pump test intake location.

Response: Existing fire hydrants surrounding the property have been indicated on sheet C3.0 and C4.1. Final location of proposed hydrants will be determined with final site plan design and fire marshal approval.

4. Location of Fire Department Connection (FDC): Shall be within 75 feet of the fire hydrant. Design planning shall accommodate that fire hose, when connected between the hydrant location and the FDC, remains unobstructed. No streetscape, bus shelters, bike racks or outdoor café shall obstruct this area. Fire hose when deployed from the FDC to

the hydrant location shall not cross roadways, driveways to/from a parking garage, or egress/access points into or away from the structure.

Response: Acknowledged. Final location of proposed FDC and hydrants will be determined with final site plan design and fire marshal approval.

5. Building Egress and Access Points: Design planning should provide that ALL egress and access points provide egress away from the building without obstructions. No streetscape, bus shelters, bike racks shall obstruct the means of egress away from the building.

Response: Acknowledged. Clear zone egress locations will be demonstrated with final architectural and site plan design, and fire marshal approval.

6. Streetscape: The Fire Official shall review and approve all streetscape to assure interoperability for the building egress, emergency responder operations and unhampered access to building systems.

Response: Acknowledged.

7. Radio Coverage Compliance: Public Safety Radio Coverage Compliance, this requirement is not only for the underground parking garage but includes coverage requirements inside and aboveground in the building to include stairwells. The space and amplification equipment shall be provided and maintained by the building owner. Certification by a Professional Engineer shall be provided showing the testing of signal strength and coverage has been met prior to the final C.O. being issued. The City Fire Official is the point of coordination for all city emergency services for approval of radio compliance.

Response: Acknowledged.

8. Emergency Generators: Shall have a generator sized accordingly to supply and sustain fire protection systems, emergency lighting and ventilation, Public Safety Radio systems, elevator service, sump pumps as well as domestic water in order to sustain sanitary systems and other critical functions that are to remain viable during extended outages. Generators are preferred to be natural gas supplied (diesel generators are limited by fuel supply; will also require annual permits).

Response: Acknowledged. Final location, type and size will be determined in consultation with the city.

9. Designated Fire Lanes: Fire Lanes for emergency response shall be designated by Fire Official and shall be marked according to code.

Response: Acknowledged

10. Signage: Signage will be required throughout the building in accordance with requirements set by the Fire Official. This shall include identification of all exterior doors on ground level, stair and floor level landings inside stairwells, equipment rooms and FDC location. FDC shall be equipped with a "red (non-auditable) strobe light above the FDC that activates during alarm mode.

Response: Acknowledged

11. Access for Fire Apparatus including Medic Units: If it is anticipated that emergency vehicles will enter into a covered structure, applicant must supply detailed specifications to meet clearance and weight requirements for fire apparatus including medic units. This includes height, width, turning radius and weight support.

Response: Acknowledged.

12. Fire Dept Knox Box(s): Shall be installed where designated by Fire Official.

Response: Acknowledged.

13. Parking Spaces: The project shall have a least two designated parking spaces for POLICE - FIRE MARSHAL needs (including signage).

Response: Acknowledged.

14. Pre-Construction Meeting: A Pre-Construction meeting will be required to review the requirements of chapter 33 of the Virginia Statewide Fire Prevention Code.

Response: Acknowledged.

15. Applicant shall follow all codes and apply for permits for approval by the Fire Official under the Virginia Statewide Fire Prevention Code including but not limited to demolition and construction (chapter 33), blasting (chapter 56), hot work (chapter 35), removal of underground storage tanks, hazardous material mitigation, locations of fire department connections, fire command centers, Knox box locations, hydrants locations and fire lanes. Further clarification may be directed to the City Fire Marshal at (703) 248-5058.

Response: Acknowledged.

Housing and Human Services

1. See memorandum, dated September 23, 2015 for comments and further details (Enclosure 7).

Response: Acknowledged. See responses below.

2. Housing and Human Services concurs with the proposal as submitted by the Developer stating that, "the proposed residential uses will include 6% of units as affordable in accordance to the standards in the City's Zoning Ordinance." Clarification of Affordable Dwelling Unit standards is also given in the City's Affordable Housing Policy.

Response: Acknowledged.

3. In order to meet the current housing needs, we have a preference for studios and units with two or more bedrooms.

Response: Acknowledged. The applicant will continue to work with the City to satisfy affordable housing goals.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Scott Adams" followed by a forward slash and the initials "SEA".

Scott E. Adams